arXiv:gr-qc/0502004v3 14 Jan 2007

A Background Independent Description of Physical Processes

M. Spaans

Kapteyn Institute, University of Groningen, 9700 AV Groningen, The Netherlands; spaans@astro.rug.nl

Abstract. A mathematical structure is presented that allows one to define a physical process independent of any background. That is, it is possible, for a set of objects, to choose an object from that set through a choice process that is defined solely in terms of the objects in the set itself. It is conjectured that this background free structure is a necessary ingredient for a self-consistent description of physical processes and that these same physical processes are determined by the absence of any background. The properties of the mathematical structure, denoted Q, are equivalent to the three-dimensional topological manifold $2T^3 \oplus 3(S^1 \times S^2)$, two three-tori plus three handles, embedded in four dimensions. The topology of Q reproduces the basic properties of QED and Einstein gravity.

1. Introduction

One of the outstanding questions in particle physics is the unification of gravity with the electroweak and strong interactions. Much effort has been devoted in the past decades to formulate a purely geometrical and topological theory for these types of interactions. Probably best known are the theories involving 11-dimensional supergravity and superstrings. These theories have been shown recently to be unified in M-theory, although the precise formulation of the latter is not yet known. A general problem in all this is the formulation of a physical principle to lead the mathematical construction of the theory. This paper attempts to contribute to such a principle, and is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the guiding philosophy of this work, the no background principle. Section 3 presents the resulting equations of motion and links them to QED and Einstein gravity. Section 4 contains the discussion. The Einstein summation convention is used.

2. The No Background Principle

One can ask the following question: Is it possible, for a set of objects, to choose an object from that set through a choice process that is defined solely in terms of the objects in the set itself? If such a construction can be found then it is self-contained in the sense that it is independent of any background, like some fixed space-time in which objects

interact. Consequently, any theory that would derive from such a structure should be internally self-consistent, and hopefully rich enough to be non-trivial.

Note then that, in order to choose an object x, one needs to *select* it and to *distinguish* it from another object y. Both these actions are required in order to assure that some notion of an interaction between objects, like an observer using a measuring device or a force between two particles, is at least possible. In other words, one does not know, a priori, whether two selection actions have not just singled out the same object (the process is blind). With this definition of choice one can proceed to define selection and distinction operations through topological constructs, the motivation being that topology naturally allows one to work with continuous, but still discrete, building blocks, which is intuitively appealing.

First, the intersection of two loops, $S^1 \times S^1$, facilitates selection of x. Clearly, right from the start, the dimensionality of the space one works in is crucial. Three spatial dimensions are very natural here since the two loops can be non-trivially linked, so that they form a *single* entity *independent* of selection of an object through their intersection. Closed loops are desirable here to avoid boundaries, and the need to specify conditions on them. Subsequently, a sphere, S^2, with x inside it then allows distinction, $y \neq x$, for y outside of S^2 (and inside its own sphere). Of course, S^2 is curved. The intersection of two loops locally spans a plane in which the selected object lies, which constitutes an implicit selection of two of the three spatial dimensions. For self-consistency, the selection structure needs to be repeated for the two other combinations of spatial dimensions, yielding the three-torus, $T^3 = S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1$. Upto here, an object x should just be viewed as a point.

The distinct objects x and y, inside their individual S^2 spheres, need to be connected by a handle, $S^1 \times S^2$, embedded in four dimensions. Because this allows one to use distinct objects *themselves* in their *own* selection by looping them through the handle back onto T^3, thus rendering the choice process self-contained globally. This is the crucial step in the construction of a self-consistent choice structure, and all results below derive from it. Of course, the presence of handles naturally incorporates the idea that one can distinguish objects in a spatial and a temporal sense.

Finally, one just needs to consider *all* pairs $[x, y]$. This yields the connected sum of two (one for x and one for y) three-tori and three (the number of possible intersections of two loops on T^3) handles. The resulting structure, Q, is a three-dimensional topological manifold $2T^3 \oplus 3(S^1 \times S^2)$ embedded in four dimensions, where $\oplus$ denotes the connected sum, using three-ball surgery. Q can itself select and distinguish all objects that it contains through all the homeomorphisms (maps that are continuous, are bijections and have continuous inverses) that it allows. That is, Q and its homeomorphisms can construct S^1 loops and S^2 spheres that facilitate selection and distinction locally.

Any object that is locally chosen through Q can now be endowed with the symmetries that Q itself possesses. That is, any object x can also be viewed as a field value $\mathbf{q}[x]$, provided that the field $\mathbf{q}$ expresses only Q's symmetries, i.e., these symmetry properties themselves can *also* be selected and distinguished. This is an expression of

the idea that symmetry transformations that Q enjoys are just manifestations of the ways in which objects in Q are equivalent (as a class). It is conjectured then that Q is necessary in any self-consistent theory of fundamental interactions. As such, the guiding principle in this work is that the mathematical formulation of physical processes should be independent of any background while the intrinsic nature of these physical processes is, in fact, determined by the absence of any background.

3. The Equations of Motion

To get to dynamical equations, note first that T^3 and $S^1 \times S^2$ are prime three-manifolds, i.e., they cannot be written as the connected sum of other three-manifolds, and thus embody the notion of discrete, but continuous, building blocks for the choice structure. Furthermore, a three-torus defines four topologically distinct paths between any two points inside that three-torus. This is easy to see because an individual three-torus contains three loops, which one can use to detour over. Also, under homeomorphisms one can take any path (which is locally R^3) and twist it with an element from $U(1)$, which is just a complex rotation. One can also exchange the two three-tori in Q without changing the topology. These properties will be used to derive QED and Einstein gravity later on.

3.1. General Form

Now, the interactions and fields present in the equations of motion must follow directly from the topological structure of Q if one accepts the no background principle. One is lead then to a single index, denoted by λ, equation because of the four topologically distinct paths on T^3. A field $\mathbf{q}$, whose properties must still follow from the topology of Q, on some path λ in Q is selected locally through another crossing path, say μ. One has a $\mathbf{q}$ on both of these paths. The two intersecting S^1 loops that define this selection can themselves be distinguished as two single loops, denoted by case B, or one double loop, denoted by case F, on the two three-tori. Clearly, these two distinctions are exhaustive in Q. One obtains a *scalar* ($S^1 \times S^1$ is closed) derivative operator on $[S^1 \subset S^2] \times [S^1 \subset S^2]$, for case B, that is of second order and is called D^2. Similarly, one finds a scalar first order derivative operator on $[S^1 \times S^1] \subset S^2$, for case F, that is called δ. These operators are still unspecified, but they define $\mathbf{q}$'s interaction where the S^1 loops cross and select $\mathbf{q}$.

This $\mathbf{q}$ interaction must in turn be selected, along any path, by $\mathbf{q}$ itself, for complete background independence. This is achieved by looping $\mathbf{q}$ through a handle, as argued above. The *differences* between these $\mathbf{q}$ self-interactions, when summed over all intersecting paths μ, must then be zero for a given path λ. This is because the mouths of the handles can be moved as one likes (under homeomorphisms) from intersection to intersection, thus nullifying any net distinction between different interactions. One

finds thus, for some path λ, that

$$q^\mu[q_\lambda D^2 q_\mu - q_\mu D^2 q_\lambda] = 0, \tag{1B}$$

$$q'^\mu[q'_\lambda \delta q'_\mu - q'_\mu \delta q'_\lambda] = 0. \tag{1F}$$

For case B and F, i.e., for different loop distinctions, $\mathbf{q}$ cannot be the same object, which is indicated by a prime, $\mathbf{q}'$, for case F above. Note that indices refer to paths here and that, under a homeomorphism, any of the four paths can be chosen to coincide with any of the four local coordinate directions. Looking at these simple equations, one might fear that the no background principle is too limiting, but the solutions to (1) will turn out to be promising.

It is obvious that under B one distinguishes (counts) all selections that the individual S^1 loops define, and there are arbitrarily many of those, while under F one distinguishes only one object, the two intersecting S^1 loops themselves. Clearly, the latter case allows a natural interpretation in terms of the Pauli exclusion principle for fermions. Case B then refers to bosons.

Indices are raised in (1) through $q^\mu \equiv g^{\mu\nu} q_\nu$ for an, still unspecified, object $\mathbf{g}$ on the four-manifold bounded by $2T^3 \oplus 3(S^1 \times S^2)$. It is $\mathbf{g}$ that measures self-selection by first acting linearly on $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{q}'$ and then facilitating the contractions in equations (1). Hence, $\mathbf{g}$ must be *symmetric* since when x selects y, the converse is also true. One has, equally unspecified, covariant (just meaning a lower index) derivatives $\nabla_\mu^{B,F}$. For case B, $D^2 \equiv \nabla^{B\mu} \nabla_\mu^B$, and for F, $\delta \equiv i\gamma^\mu \nabla_\mu^F$ with γ^μ the Dirac matrices. The definition of δ just follows from the interpretation of case F. In this then, $\mathbf{q}'$ is a Grassmann, anti-commuting, variable, with $\mathbf{q}'^2 = 0$. This immediately eliminates the second term in equation $(1F)$.

Terms in the covariant derivatives must result from the different symmetries of Q (see QED and Einstein gravity below). Conversely, for a simply connected region one has locally, i.e., in flat space, that $g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu}$, for the Minkowski metric $\eta^{\mu\nu}$, and $\nabla_\nu = \partial_\nu$, provided that the manifold Q supports this metric signature. The latter is immediate, since it is a statement of special relativity and Q, by construction, is background-free. So information propagating on Q must do so in the same way, i.e., at the same speed, to render all observers identical.

Finally, further contraction with q^λ and q'^λ renders the left hand sides of (1) *identically* zero, as the no background principle requires. Any other result would have lead to an immediate failure of the construct. Also note then that the *form* of equations (1) is determined solely by the topology of Q and thus is invariant under homeomorphisms.

3.2. QED

One sees immediately, for $\nabla^{B,F} = \partial$, that the source-free wave equations, $D^2 q_\lambda = 0$, solve $(1B)$, while the (dimensionless) Dirac equation, $\delta q'_\lambda = q'_\lambda$, solves (1F). Furthermore, one can introduce a source field $\mathbf{s}[\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'] = \mathbf{s}[\mathbf{q}']$ to distinguish $D^2\mathbf{q}$ under case F. That

is, one merely incorporates the fact that Q distinguishes fermions and bosons, and that these can interact. Also, $\mathbf{s}$ must be linear in $\mathbf{q}'$ because selection is a linear action. The definition $A_\lambda \equiv q_\lambda$ then gives the new solution $D^2 A_\lambda = s_\lambda$ and the constraint on the source

$$A^\mu A_\lambda s_\mu - A^\mu A_\mu s_\lambda = 0. \qquad (2B)$$

Equation $(2B)$ can only be satisfied without the need for an extra symmetry, which would break self-consistency, only if the properties of a *single* path, say $\mu = \lambda = \lambda_0$, are instrumental in QED. Of course, $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{A}$ is also a solution, but does not express any interaction between fermions and bosons. Now, with a slight abuse in notation, allowed because of form invariance of all equations, the same indices λ will also be used to indicate the four *coordinate* directions along λ_0.

Then recall that any path λ_0 allows a $U(1)$ twist. Of course, this is just the gauge freedom of λ_0, denoted as e^{if} for some function $f(x)$. As a consequence, equation $(1F)$ should be invariant under the addition of an object to the interaction operator ∇^F. Obviously, this extra term must be selected by, and be linear in, $\mathbf{q}$, for self-consistency. Thus, the modified $\nabla^F_\mu = \partial_\mu + iA_\mu$ enters into (1F). In this, a single distinct path λ_0 implies that $\mathbf{A}$ is coupled through the first order derivative w.r.t. f of e^{if}. That is, only the difference between the boundaries of the path λ_0 enters into the gauge transformation. In all, this constitutes the (dimensionless) content of QED.

3.3. Einstein Gravity

The interchange symmetry of the two identical three-tori in Q, $T^3 \leftrightarrow T^3$, now yields the source object $\mathbf{T}[\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'] = \mathbf{T}'[\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}']$ for case B *and* F, given that the loop topologies that express bosons and fermions are both subsets of an individual three-torus. Obviously, the interchange symmetry also forces one to consider only *pairs* of paths, denoted for simplicity by (c_1,c_2), for which $S^1 = c_1 c_2^{-1}$ must hold. That is, as one travels from one three-torus to the other on Q, the interchange symmetry moves one right back to the starting point through identification. If one first considers case B for the dynamics, then one has $[\mathbf{gq}] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}[\mathbf{gq}]$ for the *change*, along S^1, in $\mathbf{q}$ as one combines all four paths on a three-torus with one another, i.e., one finds an object $R_{\mu\nu\kappa\lambda}$ with four indices. So $\mathbf{R}$ must yield an object $G_{\mu\nu}[\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{g}]$ that is restricted to S^1 and that has only two indices, one for c_1 and one for c_2. Equation $(2B)$ is then transformed, for $\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{q} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$, to

$$G^{\alpha\beta} G_{\lambda\mu} T_{\alpha\beta} - G^{\alpha\beta} G_{\alpha\beta} T_{\lambda\mu} = 0. \qquad (3B)$$

Again, because of form invariance of all equations, the same indices are used for the coordinate directions $\mu\nu$ along the two individual paths. On S^1 any order along c_1 and c_2 can be taken, so one has that $T_{\mu\nu} = T_{\nu\mu}$ and that $G_{\mu\nu} = G_{\nu\mu}$. One immediately finds from $(3B)$ that $G_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}$ must hold along S^1. Note that $\mathbf{q}$ now implicitly depends on $\mathbf{G}$ and that $\mathbf{q}[\mathbf{G}] = \mathbf{q}[\mathbf{T}]$ is the quantity that contains all the information about the dynamics. So one should always transform back to a $\mathbf{q}$ (or $\mathbf{q}'$ under F) form of the

equations of motion to confirm the validity of the found solution. For case B this is trivial and the shape (geometry) of S^1 is fixed by $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{T}$.

For case B, $\mathbf{g}$ can now be found given that $\mathbf{R}$ must be fixed by the *difference* $q^\mu_{c_2} - q^\mu_{c_1}$, i.e., the distinction between the two paths. So, one has again linearity in $\mathbf{q}$ and

$$q^\mu_{c_2} - q^\mu_{c_1} = q^\kappa_0 R^\mu_{\kappa\lambda\nu} c^\lambda_1 c^\nu_2, \tag{4B}$$

for the displacements c^λ_1, c^ν_2 along (c_1, c_2) and an arbitrary point 0. As expected, this is just a statement of what curvature, embodied by $\mathbf{R}$, the field $\mathbf{q}$ sees. The maximum order of derivatives of $\mathbf{g}$ in $\mathbf{G}[\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{g}]$ is two because there are two distinct paths that enter, and $\mathbf{G}$ is linear in these second derivatives because the interchange symmetry acts through S^1 (and not some higher power thereof). The constraint $\nabla^{B\mu} G_{\mu\nu} = 0$ must hold *locally* under $T^3 \leftrightarrow T^3$ since $\nabla^B \mathbf{G}[c_1] = \nabla^B \mathbf{G}[c_2] = -\nabla^B \mathbf{G}[c_1]$.

Also, for case F, under $\delta\mathbf{q}' = \mathbf{s}' \to \mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{q}' \to \mathbf{G}'$, the left hand side of equation $(1F)$ transforms analogously to case B and becomes

$$G'^{\alpha\beta} G'_{\lambda\mu} T_{\alpha\beta} = 0. \tag{3F}$$

One has identical results as above since $\mathbf{G}' = \mathbf{T}$ solves $(3F)$, after transforming back to $\mathbf{q}'$ form, through $\mathbf{q}'[\mathbf{G}']\mathbf{q}'[\mathbf{T}] = 0$. Again, because Q is self-consistent, the field $\mathbf{q}'$ that traces the dynamics of space-time must be used instead of $\mathbf{G}'$. Hence, fermions and bosons see the same geometry, $\mathbf{q}'[\mathbf{G}'] = \mathbf{q}'[\mathbf{G}]$ for case F and $\mathbf{q}[\mathbf{G}'] = \mathbf{q}[\mathbf{G}]$ for case B.

Most importantly, the equivalence principle follows quite naturally from the no background principle since the only sense of mass, as a *distinct* property, that Q possesses is through the curvature of the handles. So mass is an expression of topology here. Finally then, $\mathbf{g}$ describes a spin 2 field, because of the T^3 interchange symmetry, with four dynamic degrees of freedom from the four distinct paths on a three-torus in Q. In all, this constitutes the (dimensionless) content of Einstein gravity.

4. Discussion

Obviously, the ease with which the fundamentals of QED and Einstein gravity are reproduced is a direct consequence of the contractions with q^μ and q'^μ that are present in $(1B)$ and $(1F)$, which in turn is just a statement of self-selection, the heart of the no background principle. For gravity alone, the no background principle is then just a reformulation of Mach's principle, and nothing is new. However, one might argue that Q provides a physical interpretation for the axiom of choice in that a self-consistent choice function, as constructed above, actually leads to physical constraints. In a unified theory, all symmetries that Q allows should be considered of course. To this effect, it can be shown that Q also contains $SU(N)$ symmetries as well as relative mass scales and boundary conditions[1, 2]. Finally, the presence of the handles that allow the self-selection of objects, strongly resembles the picture of Wheeler's space-time foam.

[1] M. Spaans, Nuc. Phys. B **492**, 526 (1997).
[2] M. Spaans, arXiv:gr-qc/9901025